DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 131 EA 030 115

AUTHOR	Winter, Paul A.; McCabe, Donna H.; Newton, Rose Mary
TITLE	The Impact of Work Values and Principal Job Attributes on Principal Selection Decisions.
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Selection; Elementary Secondary Education; Personnel Evaluation; Personnel Selection; *Principals; *Teacher Attitudes; *Value Judgment; Work Attitudes; *Work Ethic

ABSTRACT

This paper examines teachers' principal-selection decisions. It is based on a study of teachers serving on school councils in Kentucky, where teachers, as members of local school councils, are empowered by reform legislation to participate in hiring decisions. The article reviews the related literature, including values theory, work values measurement, work values in education administration, selection research in education administration, and principal job attributes, and then describes the mechanism of the study on which the report is based. The study participants (N=169) were experienced teachers enrolled in graduate-education courses at a large research university in Kentucky. The study examined the effects of two between-groups factors (teacher school level and teacher dominant work value) and two within-groups factors (principal dominant work value and principal job attributes). The study participants rated each principal candidate--each rating served as a dependent variable. Findings show that teachers preferred candidates with whom they shared a dominant work value. Elementary and middle-school teachers preferred candidates oriented toward instructional leadership, whereas high school teachers preferred candidates oriented toward management. The findings suggest that teachers on school councils may need training support when called upon to participate in administrative decisions. (Contains 31 references.) (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: THE IMPACT OF WORK VALUES AND JOB ATTRIBUTES

ED 435 131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Winter
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

The Impact of Work Values and Principal Job Attributes on Principal Selection Decisions

Paul A. Winter

Donna H. McCabe

Rose Mary Newton

University of Louisville

School of Education

Educ. Bldg., Room 325

Louisville, KY 40292

Phone: (502) 852-6428

E-Mail: pawint01@ulkyvm. louisville.edu

Fax: (502) 852-0616

Paper presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) held in San Diego, California, USA.

EA 030115

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This purpose of this study was to investigate principal selection decisions made by teachers serving on school councils in a state where teachers, as members of local school councils, are empowered by reform legislation to participate in the decision to hire the school principal. The dependent variable was teacher rating of a principal candidate. There were between groups factors (teacher dominant work value and school level), and two within groups factors (principal dominant work value and principal job attributes). Teachers (N = 169) preferred candidates with whom they shared a dominant work value. Elementary and middle school teachers preferred candidates oriented towards instructional leadership. High school teachers preferred candidates oriented towards management. Findings suggest that teachers on school councils may need training support when called upon to participate in administrative decisions.

The Impact of Work Values and Principal Job Attributes on Principal Selection Decisions

The focus of the present investigation was the impact of work values on the administrative decisions of teachers operating in the role of school leader. The study participants were experienced teachers role playing teacher-administrators serving on school councils mandated by school reform legislation. The site for the study was Kentucky, where the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) vests school council members with authority to select and hire principals. The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of work values, principal job attributes, and school level on principal selection decisions made by teachers serving on school councils. An investigation, such as the present research, that examines principal selection decisions is timely. As Pounder and Young (1996) have observed, recent educational initiatives, such as site-based decision making, are impacting school administration by granting greater local autonomy relative to school governance. In some instances, teachers and parents are participating in decisions that, formerly, had been the exclusive responsibility of school administrators and members of boards of education.

Investigating the effects of work values on school administration is needed because existing research indicates work values impact organization behaviors and outcomes. Researchers have found that work values affect job satisfaction (Blood, 1969), managerial decision making (England, 1975), personnel turnover (George & Jones, 1996), organization culture (Schein, 1985) and organization commitment (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989). In a study related directly to the focus of the present research, Adkins, Russell, and Werbel (1994) found that work values influence personnel selection decisions. When corporate recruiters interviewed job applicants having work values congruent with their own, "[r]ecruiter ratings of employability were related to the decision to invite the applicant for a second interview" (p. 605).

RELATED LITERATURE

This study was informed by a review of multiple literatures. Industrial and organization psychology research provided: (a) a theoretical framework for investigating the effects of work values relative to personnel selection in schools, (b) operational definitions for work values, and (c) instrumentation for measuring work values empirically. Findings from education administration research informed the present research with respect to: (a) adopting a factorial design for the study and (b) selecting to investigate the joint effects of principal job attributes and school level.

VALUES THEORY

Rokeach (1973) defined values as follows: "A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (p. 5). Rokeach's values theory postulated that values are hierarchical in nature and affect human behaviors and decisions in social and professional situations. Because the focus of this research was the impact of values in a school work context, a modified version of Rokeach's operational definition was needed. The definition adopted for this study defined work values as: "preferences for various modes of behavior . . . which are socially desirable [in the workplace]" (Ravlin & Meglino, 1989, p. 495).

WORK VALUES MEASUREMENT

Having individuals rate values using, for example, Likert-type scales results in uniformly high ratings when all values rated are regarded as socially desirable (Crown & Marlowe, 1964). Rokeach (1973) addressed the social desirability phenomenon by constructing a forced-choice ipsative instrument that requires respondents to rank order 18 values. Rank ordering instruments yield ipsative measures in that the ranking accorded to one item on the instrument affects the rankings given to other items. Individuals ranking the same set of 18 values on the Rokeach values instrument tend to yield different values hierarchies.

Ravlin and Meglino (1987) advanced the work of Rokeach by developing the Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES), a forced-choice instrument used to measure four values validated specifically as work values: achievement, concern for other, fairness, and honesty. The CES contains 24 items composed of pairs of statements. Each statement within a pair reflects a work behavior associated with one of the four work values. For example, one item on the CES requires respondents to choose between "[b]eing impartial in judging disagreements" (fairness) and "[h]elping others on difficult jobs" (concern for others). Statements on the CES have been matched to "control for sex bias, social desirability, and the extent to which each statement represent[s] its specific value" (p. 426).

The items on the CES are structured to pair a statement reflective of each work value with a statement representing each of the other three work values four times. As a result, each work value appears on the CES 12 times. The maximum score for any one work value is 12 points (1 point each time a value is selected over another). The total score for the 24 forced choices cannot exceed 24 points. Most respondents rank one value higher than the others and, therefore, have a dominant work value. Because the present research required identification of a teacher's dominant work value, the CES was adopted as the work values instrument for this study.

WORK VALUES IN EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

In a recent work about the norms of school principals, Keedy, Seeley, and Bitting (1995) defined the normative frameworks of principals as "bundles of beliefs, values, and commitments providing 1) bases for consistent, predictable actions, 2) testable theories of practice, and 3) the highest standards of professional practice" (p. 7). This definition posits values are crucial to school administration because they underlie the norms that guide principal actions and decisions. However, despite the importance attributed to values with respect to principals, there have been no empirical studies addressing work values relative to principal selection.

Previous research in education administration has addressed only a subjectivist perspective of work values. Researchers have used interviews to examine work values relative to the self-reported actions and decisions of school administrators such as superintendents (e.g., Kasten & Ashbaugh, 1991), principals (e.g., Begley & Leithwood, 1990), and assistant principals (e.g., Marshall, 1992). These qualitative studies advanced subjective knowledge about work values, but did not address the lack of empirical work values studies relative to educational administration (Willower, 1994).

SELECTION RESEARCH IN EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Although, extant research is lacking with respect to empirical studies about work values, the education administration literature is rich in empirical studies about personnel selection. Education administration research contains two streams of research about selection decisions: (a) research about decisions made by administrators selecting a job candidate and (b) research about decisions made by candidates selecting a job. Teachers have served as participants in both types of research which have involved experimental designs. The dependent variables in these selection studies have been either ratings of a job candidate, or ratings of a teaching job. The independent variables of interest have been characteristics of the individual making the selection decision, characteristics of the job candidate, characteristics of the hiring organization, or characteristics of the job. Experienced teachers have been cast as job candidates rated by principals and as job applicants rating alternative teaching positions. Examples of the two streams of research described above follow.

Young and Joseph (1986) conducted a study with teachers in the role of job candidates. Principals (N = 104) rated candidates for a high school teaching position, with principal rating of a teacher candidate serving as the dependent variable. Candidate resumes operationalized the independent variables: teacher age (29 years, 49 years), teaching assignment (chemistry, physical education), and amount of candidate information (brief, complete). Using a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design, results indicated

principals rated younger candidates for a physical education position more favorably than older candidates regardless of the completeness of the candidate information provided. This finding suggested age discrimination was present in the hiring process. Researchers have performed similar experiments using the employment interview to operationalize the independent variables of interest (Young, 1984; Young & Heneman, 1986).

Young, Rinehart, and Place (1989) conducted an experiment with teachers in the role of job applicants. Experienced teachers (N = 114) reacted to video taped recruitment interviews. The dependent variable was teacher rating of the job and the independent variable was attributes of the teaching job. Teaching job attributes were operationalized according to three theories of job choice: (a) subjective theory, which emphasizes psychological attributes of the job; (b) the objective theory, which emphasizes economic attributes of the job; (c) and the critical contact theory, which emphasizes formal work requirement attributes of the job. One-way analysis of variance was the data analysis procedure. Teachers rated jobs depicted with psychological job attributes more favorably than they did jobs depicted with economic or work requirement job attributes. In other job selection studies, position advertisements (Winter, 1996) and recruitment brochures (Winter & Dunaway, 1997) have been used to operationalize the job attributes of interest.

PRINCIPAL JOB ATTRIBUTES

How candidates for a principalship perceive the job is important to the individuals responsible for making the selection decision. Previous research about the job of principal suggests that job attributes (management job attributes, instructional leadership job attributes) interact with school level (elementary school, middle school, high school) to affect principal perceptions of the job. Lunenburg and Ornstein (1996) described this interaction relative to incumbent principals:

> Differences . . . exist between elementary and secondary school principals. Most elementary principals devote more time to curriculum and instructional matters than do their secondary counterparts, and they view themselves more often as curriculum or instructional leaders than managers. Secondary school principals usually complain they have little time for curriculum and instruction (although they recognize the importance of such matters) and see themselves more often as general managers (p. 429).

Winter and Dunaway (1997) investigated the above interaction by examining the effects of principal job attributes and school level on the ratings of teachers (N = 168) in the role of job applicants rating job descriptions contained in principal recruitment brochures. Teacher rating of the job was the dependent variable. In a manner similar to the studies described earlier by Young and Joseph (1986) and Young et al. (1989). Winter and Dunaway (1997) performed a factorial experiment. Ratings of elementary and middle school applicants were more favorable when the job of principal was depicted using instructional leadership job attributes. Ratings of secondary school applicants were more favorable when the job was described using management job attributes. These results indicated that, as was the case with incumbent principals (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996), the school level of the applicant for a principalship interacted with principal job attributes. This study addressed the impact of the aforementioned interaction between principal job attributes and school level on principal selection decisions made by teachers.

ADVANCEMENTS

This study yielded two advancements relative to principal selection research. The first advancement was to cast teachers in the role of administrators selecting a school principal. Casting teachers in this role was appropriate because in Kentucky, the site for the study, teachers on school councils have authority to select principals. The second advancement was to assess the impact of the following two interactions on

principal selection decisions made by teachers: (a) teacher dominant work value by principal dominant work value, and (b) principal job attributes by school level.

METHOD

The data for this study were analyzed using a between-within split-plot factorial design. The statistical procedure was a fixed-factor 4-way ANOVA as specified by Kirk (1995, p. 568). The ANOVA contained 96 cells with the cells sizes being unequal. As recommended by Keppel (1991) for analyses involving unequal cell sizes, the ANOVA specifications included unweighted means (p. 289) and analysis of unique sources (p. 293).

The between groups factors were teacher dominant work value (achievement, concern for others, fairness, honesty) and teacher school level (elementary school, middle school, high school). The within groups factors were principal dominant work value (achievement, concern for others, fairness, honesty) and principal job attributes (management, instructional leadership). The dependent variable was an additive composite score for teacher rating of a candidate for a principal position.

PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The study participants (N = 169) were experienced teachers enrolled in graduate education courses at a large research university located in Kentucky. The participants were diverse in terms of their teaching specialties, work assignments (i.e., traditional school, magnet school), work locations (i.e., inner city, suburban, rural), and pupils served (i.e., whites, minorities). The school of education where the study was conducted is located in one of the largest school districts in the United States. At the time of the study, schools in Kentucky had been undergoing reform for about seven years as a result of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) enacted in 1990.

One result of KERA was the creation of school councils vested with authority to select principals. The school councils are composed of the principal, three teachers, and two parents, or a multiple of this configuration. Study participants role played school

council members selecting a principal from among eight candidates. The role playing procedure was realistic because all participants were familiar with school councils, and because many of the participants had either served on school councils recently, or were serving on councils at the time of the study.

The first step in the sampling procedure was to distribute consent forms to the experienced teachers requesting voluntary participation in the research. The second step was to have the 190 teachers who volunteered to participate complete the CES. Of the 190 teachers who completed the CES, 21 lacked a dominant work value and did not participate further in the study. The 169 teachers who had a dominant work value became the study sample and participated in a second phase of the research described later. Descriptive data for the study participants are displayed in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

BETWEEN GROUPS FACTORS

This study examined the effects of two between groups factors and two within groups factors. The two between groups factors were teacher school level and teacher dominant work value. Teacher school level was an assigned variable based on actual teaching assignments and was composed of three levels: elementary school, middle school, and high school. As had been done in a previous study by Judge and Bretz (1992), participant scores on the CES were used to operationalize teacher dominant work value. For example, if a participant scored highest on achievement, the participant was classified as having achievement as a dominant work value. There were four levels for teacher dominant work value: achievement, concern for others, fairness, and honesty.

WITHIN GROUPS FACTORS

The two within groups factors were principal dominant work value and principal job attributes. Principal dominant work value had four levels: achievement, concern for others, fairness, and honesty. Principal job attributes had two levels: management and instructional leadership. The eight (4 x 2 = 8) combinations of principal dominant work value and principal job attributes were used to depict eight candidates for a principal position. The study participants rated each principal candidate, with teacher rating of a principal candidate serving as the dependent variable for the study. A principal selection instrument was constructed to operationalize the within groups independent variables and the dependent variable.

The principal candidates presented to the teachers on the selection instrument were described as having been through a preliminary screening process and as having been judged "equally qualified" for the job in terms of education, certification level, and job experience. Instructions on the instrument stated that eight candidates had been rated at a district assessment center. Based on the assessment center ratings, the candidates differed only with respect to two factors: (a) work value ratings and (b) preferences for one of two job descriptions for a principal position.

The four levels of principal dominant work value (achievement, concern for others, fairness, honesty) were operationalized using a procedure similar to one developed by Ravlin and Meglino (1987). Principal work value ratings were placed on the principal selection instrument. The ratings consisted of 7-point scales with three anchors: "poor" (rating of 1), "acceptable for hiring" (rating of 4) and "outstanding" (rating of 7). The ratings specified that each principal was "outstanding" on one work value and "acceptable for hiring" on the other work values.

To assist the participants in performing the principal selection task, the instruments contained operational definitions for the work values. The definitions were descriptions of principals behaving in a manner consistent with one of the four work

values, and were based on the content of statements from the CES (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987, 1989). The definition for achievement was: "The principal works hard, seeks all opportunities to learn new skills, sacrifices to accomplish job requirements, and sets high standards for performance." The definition for concern for others was: "The principal helps colleagues, encourages teachers and students who are having a difficult time, and shares information and resources with others." A principal exhibiting fairness as a work value was described as follows: "The principal considers different points of view before acting, tries to resolve disagreements impartially, and judges people based on their abilities rather than on their personalities." The description for a principal emphasizing honesty was: "The principal sticks to his/her true convictions, admits and accepts consequences for mistakes, and refuses to do things known to be wrong."

Each job candidate was depicted also as preferring one of two job descriptions, which appeared on the research instruments. Each job description contained six principal job attributes. The procedures for selecting and validating the content of the job descriptions were reported in a study by Winter and Dunaway (1997, p. 148). The job description used to operationalize the management job attributes was: "The most important principal job duties are: (a) planning, organizing , and coordinating daily operations of the school; (b) ensuring school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment; (c) providing for management, allocation, and control of fiscal and human resources; (d) maintaining effective school discipline; (e) implementing appropriate, and legally sound, policies and procedures for school operations; and (f) using effective problem-solving and decision-making techniques." The job description used to operationalize the instructional leadership job attributes was: "The most important principal job duties are: (a) setting and implementing clear instructional objectives; (b) implementing evaluation strategies for improving instruction; (c) demonstrating skill in the recruitment, selection, and assignment of instructional staff; (d) providing continuous development opportunities for

instructional staff; (e) communicating standards for expected academic performance; and (f) providing leadership for curriculum development."

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable for the study was teacher rating of a principal candidate. The study instruments contained descriptions of eight candidates for a principal position with each candidate depicted as having a dominant work value and as having a preference for a job description emphasizing either management or instructional leadership attributes of a principal job. Two items were used to rate each job candidate. The two items were: (a) "How likely are you as a search committee member to invite this candidate for a final interview?" and (b) "How likely are you as a search committee member to offer this candidate the job?" Both items had 7-point Likert-type scales (7 being most favorable), and were anchored at the low end by "not at all likely" and at the high end by "very likely".

The two rating items were summed to form an additive composite score for the dependent variable, teacher rating of a principal candidate. Each study participant rated eight candidates, thereby, providing eight repeated measures for the dependent variable. When an ANOVA procedure involves repeated measures, order effects may occur. To control for order effects, the instruments were structured to counterbalance the order of the eight candidate descriptions and the rating scales. Procedures described by Keppel (1991) were followed to accomplish the counterbalancing.

PILOT STUDY

Prior to the actual study, the instruments were administered to a pilot group (N = 30). The pilot study objectives were to: (a) assess reliability of the eight composite scores, (b) check manipulation of the within groups variables, and (c) evaluate participant understanding of the selection task. The pilot participants completed the principal selection instrument and a 4-item multiple-choice questionnaire.

Coefficient alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the eight composite scores. The results of the coefficient alpha computations were: .87, .89, .89, .84, .87, .79, .84, and .88. These coefficients were well within the range recommended by Nunnally (1967) for use of composite scores in statistical analysis.

The 4-item questionnaire was used to perform the manipulation checks. The research intent was for study participants to perceive the following: (a) each candidate was "outstanding" on one work value, and "acceptable for hiring" on three work values; (b) each candidate preferred either management or instructional leadership attributes of the job; (c) each candidate had been screened previously by the school council and by a district assessment center; and (d) there were eight candidates to be rated.

The questionnaire item used to check manipulation of candidate dominant work values was: "With respect to the work value ratings provided for the job candidates you reviewed, which of the following statements describes the simulation best?" Possible responses to this item included: (a) candidates were rated outstanding on two values and acceptable for hiring on two values, (b) candidates were rated outstanding on three values and acceptable for hiring on one value, (c) candidates were rated outstanding on one value and acceptable for hiring on three values, and (d) candidates were rated outstanding on one value and acceptable for hiring on one value. The correct response was (c). The questionnaire contained similar manipulation checks for principal job attributes, stage of the selection process, and number of job candidates. Twenty-eight (93.3%) of the 30 pilot participants responded to all items on the questionnaire correctly, indicating the participants perceived, as intended, both the manipulations for the within groups independent variables, and the specifications of the selection exercise.

RESULTS

The independent variables for this study were teacher dominant work value (achievement, concern for others, fairness, honesty), school level (elementary school,

middle school, high school), principal dominant work value (achievement, concern for others, fairness, honesty), and principal job attributes (management, instructional leadership). The dependent variable was teacher rating of a principal candidate. The 4-way ANOVA procedure made it possible to test fifteen null hypotheses. There were four hypotheses for the main effects, six hypotheses for the two-way interactions, four hypotheses for the three-way interactions, and one hypothesis for the four-way interaction. Also, this design resulted in eight repeated measures for the dependent variable. The computed reliability coefficients for the repeated measures, using coefficient alpha, were: .90, .92, .91, .90, .88, .89, .92, and .92.

Three null hypotheses were rejected. At the specified alpha level (.05), there were three significant effects: (a) a first-order interaction for teacher dominant work value by principal dominant work value, (b) a first-order interaction for principal job attributes by school level, and (c) a main effect for principal job attributes. When a significant main effect is subsumed by a significant interaction effect, as was the case with the principal job attributes main effect, unambiguous interpretations of the main effects are problematic. The appropriate procedure is to focus analysis and interpretation on the interaction term (Keppel, 1991, p. 196). Accordingly, the post hoc analyses concentrated on the significant two-way interactions.

The analysis of the significant teacher dominant work value by principal dominant work value interaction consisted of two steps. The first step was to compute the simple main effects for principal dominant work value at each level of teacher dominant work value. There were significant differences among the group means for principal dominant work value at all levels of teacher dominant work value. Results by level were: (a) achievement, F (3, 75) = 11.87, $p < .0001$; (b) concern for others, F (3, 66) = 13.55, $p < .0001$; (c) fairness, F (3, 255) = 20.22, $p < .0001$; and (d) honesty, F (3, 99) = 16.28, $p < .0001$.

The second step in the analysis of the teacher dominant work value by principal dominant work value interaction was to make all pairwise comparisons between group means for levels of principal dominant work value at each level of teacher dominant work value. Because the cell sizes for these comparisons were equal, the Tukey (HSD) procedure was used to test for significant mean differences. Results of the Tukey (HSD) tests are summarized in Table 2, with the group means arrayed from left to right in descending order of magnitude. Cell sized are shown in parentheses.

Insert Table 2 about here

The pattern of significance shown in Table 2 indicated teachers rated principal candidates with whom they shared a dominant work value more favorably than they rated candidates with whom they did not share a dominant work value. This interaction occurred at all levels of teacher dominant work value.

The significant principal job attributes by school level interaction was analyzed by examining the simple main effects for principal job attributes at each school level. This analysis rendered two significant mean differences. Teachers at the elementary school level , $F(1, 82) = 30.18$, $p < .0001$, and the middle school level, $F(1, 48) = 12.03$, $p < .001$, rated principal job candidates preferring instructional leadership job attributes more favorably than they did candidates preferring management job attributes. At the high school level, a reverse pattern emerged. High school teachers rated candidates preferring management job attributes more favorably than they did candidates preferring instructional leadership job attributes. The difference in mean ratings at the high school level was slightly less than the magnitude required to achieve statistical significance, $F(1, 36) = 3.81$, $p < .06$.

DISCUSSION

Findings from this study provide new knowledge about work values in schools and about factors that influence principal selection decisions made by teachers. Results demonstrate the feasibility of using empirical measures of teacher work values for research and for practical applications. This study is the first empirical examination of selection decisions made by teachers who have legal authority to select principals. Study results suggest that the interaction of teacher and principal work values, and the interaction of principal job attributes and school level, affect the decisions of teachers acting in the role of principal selector. These findings have implications for work values theory, selection practice, and future selection research.

IMPLICATIONS FOR VALUES THEORY

Study results demonstrate it is possible to measure teacher work values in the context of a specific school administration task. As was the case with research conducted in other professional settings (Adkins, Russell & Werbel, 1994; Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1989; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987), experienced teachers appear to have internal work value hierarchies that influence administrative decisions such as principal selection. These findings are consistent with work values theory (Ravlin and Meglino, 1987, 1989; Rokeach, 1973). Study findings are supportive also of previous research findings indicating work values influence work-related decisions and behaviors (Blood, 1969; England, 1975; George & Jones, 1996; Locke, 1976; Schein, 1985).

IMPLICATIONS FOR SELECTION PRACTICE

Existing research indicates work values impact work outcomes such as job satisfaction (Blood, 1969), organization culture (Schein, 1985), turnover (George & Jones, 1996), and organization commitment (Meglino, Ravlin & Adkins, 1989). Because such outcomes affect school success, school administrators, and committees responsible

for selecting personnel have a stake in acquiring the capacity to determine if individuals applying for a position have work values congruent with school needs.

The results of this study must be regarded as preliminary. However, progress has been made with respect to using work values as a selection tool. For example, in school reform settings such as the site for this study (i.e., Kentucky), improved student achievement is a desired outcome. Findings from this study suggest it is possible to measure applicants for principal positions and determine whether or not the applicants hold achievement as a work value. Work values are relevant also to the selection of other education personnel such as teachers and superintendents. When more extensive findings become available, appropriate procedures (Young & Ryerson, 1986) exist already for validating work values as selection criteria.

The significant principal job attributes by school level interaction has implications for principal selection decisions made by teachers serving on school councils. Teachers, as applicants for a principal position, were shown in previous research (Winter & Dunaway, 1997) to vary in their ratings of job descriptions contained in principal recruitment brochures. Elementary and middle school teachers preferred a principal job described with instructional leadership job attributes, while high school teachers preferred a principal job described with management job attributes. A similar interaction occurred in the present study. However, instead of rating the job (Winter & Dunaway, 1997), the teachers in this study rated job candidates. Elementary and middle school teachers preferred candidates for a principal position oriented towards instructional leadership. High school teachers preferred candidates oriented towards management.

Study findings indicate teachers may select principals using job attribute preferences that are biased according to the school level of the teacher selector's job assignment. This bias is inconsistent with best administrative practice, which requires principals to have a broad base of managerial and instructional leadership skills

(Bridges, 1982; Hallinger & Heck, 1996). The school level by job attributes interaction may suggest a need for changes in the curricula of teacher preparation programs and in-service programs.

Based on the results of this study, it appears that teachers, in their capacity as school council members, may need formal training in such administrative tasks as personnel selection. In fact, the findings of recent research conducted in Kentucky (David, 1994) indicate teachers enter service on school councils unprepared for the leadership and administrative duties they are expected to fulfill. The administrative tasks that appear to be most problematic for school council members are personnel-related, such as the principal selection decisions addressed in the present research:

> The most difficult issues councils face have to do with personnel. Most of the questions, concerns, and conflicts are related to vacancies, transfers, supplemental salaries, new positions, itinerant staff, and related issues. (p. 709)

IMPLICATIONS FOR SELECTION RESEARCH

The work values of achievement, concern for others, fairness, and honesty are relevant to teaching, learning, and school administration. However, four values are too small a number of values to gain a comprehensive understanding of how work values affect schools. Future investigations should address the influence of additional work values, including the effects of work values, such as power and control, that may not be socially desirable. Such research will require development of valid and reliable instruments to measure a larger set of work values than was used in this research.

With respect to the four work values that were examined in this study, future research should address the decisions of other individuals involved in personnel selection. The decisions of principals, superintendents, and board of education members should become the focus of future selection studies. Parental decisions should be a research focus also when, as was the case with this study, school reform legislation mandates parental participation in personnel selection.

Finally, additional selection research is needed to explore the influence of work values in combination with other factors. This study addressed the joint effects of work values and candidate job attribute preferences. Future research should examine work values in combination with other candidate characteristics such as race, prior work experiences, and academic specialty. Other attributes of the principalship merit empirical investigation also. Future research should examine the effects of principal job attributes such as communication job attributes and political job attributes.

LIMITATIONS

Researchers and practitioners should interpret the results of this study within certain limitations. These limitations relate to the research site and the research procedures. The teachers participating in the present research rated simulated candidates for the job of principal. It is possible that teachers rating candidates under actual principal selection conditions might have reacted differently. Teachers from other geographical areas might have held different work values and might have rated candidates such as those depicted in this study differently. Also, the teachers in this study made decisions based on a limited number of candidate work values and a limited number of principal job attributes. Studies requiring teachers to use other work values and other principal attributes might have yielded different results.

CONCLUSION

This study rendered new knowledge about work values in schools. Work values appear to impact administrative decisions. Used in an enlightened manner, work values may be used in the future to improve such administrative practices as principal selection. The work values investigated in this study may prove to be as relevant to teaching and learning as they were shown to be to school administration.

With respect to the principal selection process generally, this study yielded new knowledge also. As school reform mandates vest teachers with the authority to act as administrators, it is important to gain an understanding of how teachers perform in this

new role. The acquisition of administrative authority does not translate automatically into the capacity to perform administrative work. Changes in teacher preparation, or in-service training for teachers assuming administrative duties, may be required to support school reform initiatives.

The instructional skills teachers bring to the classroom are, of course, a vital factor in the success of schools. However, as efforts to reform schools intensify, teachers are called upon, increasingly, to act in the role of school leader. It is hoped that the findings from this study will focus the attention of researchers and practitioners alike on the need to support teachers with appropriate education and training so that, when called upon to do so, teachers can perform successfully as leaders and administrators.

REFERENCES

Adkins, C. L., Russell, C. J., & Werbel, J. D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. Personnel Psychology, 47, 605-623.

Begley, P. T., & Leithwood, K. A. (1990). The influence of values on school administrator practices. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 3, 337-352.

Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 456-459.

Bridges, E. M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 12-33

Crown, J. E., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence. New York: Wiley.

David, J. L. (1994). School-based decision making: Kentucky's test of decentralization. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 706-712.

England, G. W. (1975). The manager and his values: An international perspective from the United States, Japan, Korea, India, and Australia. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 318-325.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32, 5-44.

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. Jr. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 261-271.

Kasten, K. L., & Ashbaugh, C. R. (1991). The place of values in superintendents' work. Journal of Educational Administration, 29, 54-66.

Keedy, J. L., Seeley, D. S., & Bitting, P. F. (1995). Principal construction of normative frameworks: Improving schooling for students. Educational Considerations, 23, 6-10.

Keppel, G. (1991). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kirk, R. E. (1995). Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Lunenburg, F. C. & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). Educational administration: Concepts and practices (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Marshall, C. (1992). School administrators' values: A focus on atypicals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 368-386.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 424-432.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pounder, D. G. & Young, I. P. (1996). Recruitment and selection of educational administrators: Priorities for today's schools. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), A. W. Hart (Section Ed.), The International Handbook for Educational Leadership and Administration (pp. 279-308). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1987). Effect of Values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 666-673.

Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1989). The transitivity of work values: Hierarchical preference ordering of socially desirable stimuli. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 44, 494-508.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willower, D. J. (1994). Values, valuation and explanation in school organizations. Journal of School Leadership, 4, 466- 483.

Winter, P. A. (1996). Applicant evaluations of formal position advertisements: The influence of sex, job message content, and information order. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10, 105-116.

Winter, P. A., & Dunaway, D. M. (1997). Reactions of teachers, as applicants, to principal recruitment practices in a reform environment: The effects of job attributes, job information source, and school level. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 30, 144-153.

Young, I. P. (1984). Effects of interpersonal performance style in simulated teacher selection interviews. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17, 43-51.

Young, I. P., & Heneman, H. G. III (1986). Predictors of interviewee reaction in simulated teacher selection interviews. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19, 29-37.

Young, I. P., & Joseph, G. (1989). Effects of chronological age, skill obsolescence, quality of information, and focal position on evaluation by principals. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 2, 355-364.

Young, Rinehart, & Place (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5, 329-336.

Young, I. P., & Ryerson, D. (1986). Teacher selection: Legal, practical, and theoretical aspects. Monograph published by University Council for Educational Administration : Tempe, AZ.

Table 1

Descriptive Data for Study Participants

Variable	N	M	SD	Range
Age	169	37.6	8.4	24-55
Teaching Experience (Years)	169	8.7	6.8	1-29
Gender	169	(a)	(a)	(a)
School Level	169	(a)	(a)	(a)
Race	169	(b)	(b)	(b)
Degree Level	169	(c)	(c)	(c)

(a) Gender: 132 females (75 elementary school, 37 middle school, 20 high school), 37 males (8 elementary school, 12 middle school, 17 high school)

(b) Race: 152 white, 14 African-American, 1 Hispanic, 2 Asian-American

(c) Degree Level: 81 baccalaureate, 87 masters, 1 doctorate

Table 2

Results of Tukey (HSD) Tests for Differences Between Group Means for Principal Dominant Work Value by Level of Teacher Dominant Work Value

	Principal Values			
Teacher Values	Mean (n)	Mean (n)	Mean (n)	Mean (n)
Achieve				
	Achieve	Concern	Honesty	Fairness
	11.50	8.96	8.96	8.88
	(26)	(26)	(26)	(26)
Concern				
	Concern	Fairness	Honesty	Achieve
	11.57	9.37	8.83	8.61
	(23)	(23)	(23)	(23)
Fairness				
	Fairness	Achieve	Concern	Honesty
	11.09	9.33	9.19	9.00
	(86)	(86)	(86)	(86)
Honesty				
	Honesty	Concern	Fairness	Achieve
	11.66	9.75	9.38	9.24
	(34)	(34)	(34)	(34)

Note. Means connected by a line are not significantly different. Numbers in parentheses are cell sizes.